

BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.

Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq., CA Bar No. 285256

mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com

1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 450

Los Angeles, California 90067

Tel: (310) 975-1493; Fax: (310) 675-0861

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.

Joshua S. Falakassa, CA Bar No. 295045

josh@falakassalaw.com

1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 450

Los Angeles, California 90067

Tel: (818) 456-6168; Fax: (888) 505-0868

Attorneys Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

SHARON DAVIDSON, on behalf of the State of
California,

Plaintiff,

v.

DG PREMIUM BRANDS, LLC., a California
Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1-50,
inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **24STCV09682**

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

(1) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT (LABOR CODE § 2698 *et seq.*)**

UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE

1 Plaintiff Sharon Davidson (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of the State of California, hereby brings this
2 PAGA Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendant DG Premium Brands,
3 LLC. (“Defendant”), and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively “Defendants”) and each of them, as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. Defendant is a global manufacturer and marketer of private label apparel for men,
6 women, and children, including brands such as 7 Jeans and Splendid.

7 2. Plaintiff brings this PAGA representative action solely on behalf of the State of
8 California against Defendant for alleged violations of the California Labor Code.

9 3. **Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by**
10 **California Labor Code § 2699.**

11 4. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay all overtime
12 compensation and sick pay wages at the proper legal rates by failing to calculate the “regular rate of
13 pay properly.” In addition, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant’s meal and rest period policies and
14 practices failed to allow and permit aggrieved employees to take all compliant and timely meal and
15 rest periods or pay premium wages at the “regular rate of pay” in lieu thereof. Plaintiff further alleges
16 that Defendant failed to provide aggrieved employees with accurate written itemized wage statements
17 in violation of Labor Code § 226(a) and failed to timely pay all final wages upon separation of
18 employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203.

19 5. Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class action
20 and representative action to recover unpaid wages, restitution, penalties, and other related relief for
21 herself and all other similarly situated aggrieved employees.

22 **JURISDICTION**

23 6. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California, brings this representative action pursuant
24 to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, seeking penalties for Defendant’s violation of California Labor Code
25 §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 221, 226(a), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1174, 1174.4,
26 1199, and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“Wage Orders”).

27 7. Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff and all aggrieved employees are aggrieved
28 employees within the meaning of Labor Code §2699, *et seq.*

8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant's violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders because the amount in controversy exceeds this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

VENUE

9. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as most of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in the County of Los Angeles. Defendant owns, maintains offices, transacts business, has an agent or agents within the County of Los Angeles, and/or otherwise are found within the County of Los Angeles, and Defendant is within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

PARTIES

10. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff, who is over the age of 18, was and currently is a California resident residing in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as an aggrieved employee.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are authorized to do business within the County of Los Angeles and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Class Members during the applicable statutory periods. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants' policies and/or practices complained of herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed to her by California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 221, 226(a), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1174, 1174.4, 1199, and the California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, and applicable Wage Orders.

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the four years preceding the filing of the Complaint and continuing to the present, Defendants did (and continue to do) business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

13. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious Defendants, whether individual, partners, or

1 corporate, were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and
2 proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes to be subject to the unlawful employment practices
3 alleged herein.

4 14. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
5 herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and all members of the Classes. At all
6 times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter
7 alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the Defendants, and each of
8 them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as
9 well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course
10 and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned,
11 and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

12 15. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and
13 engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise and acting within the course and
14 scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff
15 alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and all members of the
16 Classes.

17 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18 16. Defendant is a global manufacturer and marketer of private label apparel for men,
19 women, and children, including brands such as 7 Jeans and Splendid. Plaintiff was employed by
20 Defendant as a non-exempt employee with the title of “Store Manager.”

21 17. Plaintiff began working for Defendants on October 5, 2023. Plaintiff and other
22 aggrieved employees (including, but not limited to, Stylist, Production Scheduler, Purchasing Clerk,
23 Receiving Supervisor, Sales Manager, and all other aggrieved positions) were responsible for all
24 aspects of Defendant’s business in California. However, in these roles, Plaintiff and other aggrieved
25 employees were often not afforded all protections and rights conferred under the California Labor
26 Code and applicable wage orders.

27 18. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees regularly worked
28 various shifts, many of which were in excess of 8.0 hours in a workday and 40.0 hours in a workweek.

1 Plaintiff alleges that other aggrieved employees were also subjected to the same policies, procedures,
2 practices, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations to which she was
3 subjected during her employment.

4 19. First, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked regular
5 shifts that lasted longer than 8.0 hours in a workday and resulted in aggrieved employees regularly
6 working more than 40 hours in a workweek. However, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were
7 not properly paid at the correct overtime rate for all overtime hours worked due to Defendant's
8 uniform failure to include all forms of compensation/remuneration, including, but not limited to,
9 commissions, incentives, non-discretionary bonuses, and all other forms of remuneration in
10 calculating the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of overtime compensation.

11 20. Under the California Labor Code (as well as the FLSA), courts have consistently held
12 that regularly paid non-discretionary bonuses (and other forms of pay) must be included in
13 determining an employee's "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime. (See *Haber v.*
14 *The Americana Corp.* 378 F. 2d 854, 855-856 (9th Cir. 1967) [holding that regularly paid efficiency
15 bonuses must be included in calculating the "regular rate"]; *Wang v. Chinese Daily News, Inc.* 435 F.
16 Supp. 2d 1042, 1055-1057 (C.D. Cal. 2006) [granting summary judgement to Plaintiff under
17 California and federal law on the grounds, that Defendants improperly calculated overtime by
18 excluding annual bonuses paid to employees from the "regular rate of compensation"]; see *Walling*
19 *v. Youngerman-Reynolds Hardwood Co.* (1945) 65 S.Ct. 1242, 1245. ("The regular rate by its very
20 nature must reflect all payments which the parties have agreed shall be received regularly during the
21 workweek, exclusive of overtime payments. It is not an arbitrary label chosen by the parties; it is an
22 actual fact. Once the parties have decided upon the amount of wages and the mode of payment the
23 determination of the regular rate becomes a matter of mathematical computation, the result of which
24 is unaffected by any designation of a contrary 'regular rate' in the contracts."); see also 29 CFR §§
25 778.110 ("production bonus") and 778.111 ("piece-rate").)

26 21. Labor Code § 510 requires an employer to compensate an employee who works more
27 than eight (8.0) hours in one workday, forty (40) hours in a workweek, and for the first eight (8.0)
28 hours worked on the seventh consecutive day, no less than one and one-half times (1 1/2) the regular

1 rate of pay. In addition, Labor Code § 510 obligates employers to compensate employees at no less
2 than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve (12) hours in a workday
3 or more than eight (8.0) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. Pursuant to Section 3 of the
4 applicable Wage Orders, aggrieved employees shall not be employed more than eight (8.0) hours in
5 any workday or more than 40.0 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-
6 half (1 1/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the
7 workweek.

8 22. By their policy of requiring Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees to work in
9 excess of eight (8.0) hours in a workday and/or forty (40.0) hours in a workweek without
10 compensating them at the lawful rate of one-half (1 1/2) their regular rate of pay, Defendant willfully
11 violated the provisions of Labor Code § 510 and the applicable Wage Orders.

12 23. Accordingly, through PAGA and to the extent permitted by law, Plaintiff and other
13 aggrieved employees are entitled to recover penalties for violations of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510,
14 1194, 1197.1, 1199 1197.1 under Labor Code § 1197.1, 1199, or Labor Code § 2699(f)(2), and for
15 attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

16 24. Furthermore, at all relevant times, Defendant also failed in its obligation to provide
17 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate pursuant
18 to Labor Code §§ 246(a),(b), which requires that "[a]n employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works
19 in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of
20 employment is entitled to paid sick days. . . at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours
21 worked, beginning at the commencement of employment." Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid
22 sick time for aggrieved employees must be "calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay
23 for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually
24 works overtime in that workweek."

25 25. Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be "calculated
26 by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total
27 hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Finally, Labor Code §246(i)
28 requires employers to "provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid

1 sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either
2 the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided
3 on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

4 26. Here, at all relevant times, Defendant failed in its obligation to provide Plaintiff and
5 other aggrieved employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate, including all forms of
6 compensation, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a), (b). As such, Defendant paid sick time below the
7 "regular rate of pay" as required by Labor Code §§ 246(l) (1-2). Based on the foregoing Labor Code
8 violations, Plaintiff seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code
9 § 2699(f)(2), and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

10 27. Moreover, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were denied
11 compliant and timely 30-minute off-duty meal periods as mandated by California law. Due to
12 Defendant's uniform meal period policies/practices, operational requirements, work demands, and
13 staffing shortages, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees often could not take timely and
14 uninterrupted net 30-minute first meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work. Further, when
15 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked more than 10.0 hours in a shift, they were not allowed
16 and permitted to take a mandated second meal period before the end of the tenth hour of work in
17 violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. Indeed, Plaintiff's and other aggrieved
18 employees' meal periods were often interrupted and lasted fewer than 30 minutes due to Defendant's
19 meal period policies/practices, operational requirements, and work demands. In addition, Defendant
20 had the unlawful policy/ practice of making Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees take their meal
21 period after the fifth hour of work.

22 28. In addition, for each missed or non-compliant meal period, Defendant failed and
23 continues to fail to maintain a mechanism by which aggrieved employees were paid meal period
24 premiums at the "regular rate of pay" pursuant to *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11
25 5th 858 and Labor Code § 226.7.

26 29. Accordingly, due to Defendant's uniform meal period policies/practices, aggrieved
27 employees were also regularly denied legally compliant meal periods in violation of Labor Code §§
28 226.7, 510, 516, and applicable Wage Orders, and would be entitled to penalties under Labor Code §

1 2698 *et seq.*

2 30. Next, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not provided
3 with all uninterrupted 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or a major fraction thereof
4 due to Defendant's uniform rest period policies/practices, operational requirements, work demands,
5 and staffing shortages. As a result, other aggrieved employees were and are often unable to take a net
6 10-minute duty-free rest period for every major fraction of four hours worked. This includes a second
7 rest period for shifts in excess of six hours and a third rest period for shifts in excess of 10 hours in a
8 workday.

9 31. By not relieving all aggrieved employees of all duties during rest periods, Defendant
10 failed to provide legally compliant rest periods. See *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016)
11 2 Cal. 5th 257, 269 [concluding that "during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all
12 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time."] (Emphasis added). In *Augustus*,
13 the California Supreme Court expressly rejected the employer's assertion that it could provide an on-
14 duty rest period to employees who worked as security guards and further explained: "that employers
15 [must] relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time and relieve their employees
16 of all duties." *Id.* at 273. Each time aggrieved employees could not take a compliant rest period,
17 Defendant failed and continues to fail to adequately pay rest period premium payments at the "regular
18 rate of pay" as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

19 32. Accordingly, due to Defendant's uniform rest period policies/practices, aggrieved
20 employees were regularly denied legally compliant rest breaks in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7,
21 512, and applicable Wage Orders, and would be entitled to penalties under Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

22 33. As a result of Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for
23 all hours they were subject to the control of Defendant, including all overtime, sick pay wages, and
24 Defendant's failure to adequately pay for all overtime and meal and rest period premiums at the
25 "regular rate of pay," Defendant issued wage statements which failed to identify the gross wages
26 earned accurately, the total hours worked, the net wages earned, and the correct corresponding
27 number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1, 2, 5, and 9).

28 ///

34. Labor Code § 226.3 provides that “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial violation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.”

35. Thus, for the violations of Labor Code section 226 described above, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees may also recover Labor Code § 226.3 penalties for Defendant's violations of Labor Code § 226(a). Consequently, because Defendant failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees would be entitled to recover penalties under Labor Code §§ 226(e) and/or 2698 *et seq.*

36. Finally, because of Defendant's failure to pay all overtime, sick pay wages, and meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Defendant also failed and continues to fail to pay the aggrieved employees all wages owed at their time of separation from employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203. Thus, aggrieved employees would be entitled to recover penalties under Labor Code §§ 201-203 and/or 2698 *et seq.*

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(Plaintiff and Similarly Aggrieved Employees Against All Defendants)

37. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

38. Defendant has committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees. Plaintiff, an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, acting on behalf of the State of California, brings this representative action against Defendant to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other similarly aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to (1) \$100 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided based on the following Labor Code violations:

1 a) Defendant's failure to pay all overtime wages at the "regular rate of pay" because
2 Defendant failed to include all forms of compensation, including, but not limited to, shift differentials,
3 non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, and other forms of remuneration;

4 b) Defendant's failure to pay all sick pay at the "regular rate of pay";

5 c) Defendant's failure to allow and permit legally compliant meal periods or compensation
6 at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof;

7 d) Defendant's failure to allow and permit legally compliant rest periods or compensation
8 at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof;

9 e) Defendant's failure to furnish legally compliant wage statements pursuant to Labor
10 Code § 226(a);

11 f) Defendant's failure to pay all wages in a timely fashion in violation of Labor Code §
12 204; and

13 g) Defendant's failure to timely pay final wages to aggrieved employees at the time of
14 separation from employment was unlawful,

15 39. On or about December 21, 2023, Plaintiff notified Defendant DG Premium Brands,
16 LLC. via certified mail and the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA")
17 via its website of Defendant's violations of the California Labor Code § 2698 *et. seq.* with respect to
18 violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 40 (a)-(i). Now that sixty-five days
19 (65) have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendant of these violations, Plaintiff has exhausted her
20 administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect
21 to these violations.

22 40. Plaintiff was compelled to retain counsel to file this court action to protect her interests
23 and the interests of other similarly aggrieved employees and to assess and collect the civil penalties
24 owed by Defendant. Plaintiff has, therefore, incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which she is entitled
25 to receive under California Labor Code § 2699.

26 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

27 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for judgment on behalf of the State of California against
28 Defendant, as follows:

1 1. Upon the First Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to similarly aggrieved
2 employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (a) and (f)
3 including, but not limited to: (1) \$100 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation
4 per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is
5 specifically provided under the Labor Code;

6 2. For attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, and Code
7 of Civil Procedure §1021.5; and

8 3. For such other relief that the Court may deem just and proper.
9

10 Dated: April 17, 2024

FALAKSSA LAW, P.C.
BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.

11
12
13 By: _____

14 Joshua Falakassa, Esq.
15 Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq.
16 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Classes
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28